

Porter, Janet

From: Woods, Eric
 Sent: Monday, December 02, 2002 1:44 PM
 To: Porter, Janet
 Cc: Vanarsdale, Chuck
 Subject: FW: borrow pit drawing comments

Janet,

We need to format and respond to fish and wildlife's comment below:

"Could we make a very gradual slope (e.g., 100:1) on one side of each of the pools in the borrow area. This would get us more expansive areas of shallow water. Shorebirds would like it, at least until it became heavily vegetated. It might also be better for amphibians other than bullfrogs. Bullfrogs have taken over the mitigation bank wetlands at Slate Run Metropark."

I will work with chuck to draft a response. Chuck is reviewing the draft responses to OEPA's comments.

Thanks, Eric

-----Original Message-----

From: Bill_Kurey@fws.gov [mailto:Bill_Kurey@fws.gov]
 Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2002 1:08 PM
 To: pete.yerace@fernald.gov; eric.woods@fernald.gov
 Cc: tom.schneider@epa.state.oh.us
 Subject: Re: borrow pit drawing comments

----- Forwarded by Bill Kurey/R3/FWS/DOI on 11/26/2002 01:04 PM -----

"Tom Schneider"

| | | |
|--|----------------------|---------------------|
| <Bill_Kurey@fws.gov> | <Tom.Schneider@epa.s | To: |
| Bartoszek" <Joe.Bartoszek@epa.state.oh.us> | tate.oh.us> | cc: "Joe |
| pit drawing comments | | Subject: Re: borrow |
| | 11/26/2002 07:56 AM | |

Bill,
 That sounds good to me. Go ahead and email your comment to Eric and Pete.
 We're worried about the bullfrogs too. Thats why we want to keep most small ponds less that 3' deep so they will dry out every few years and kill them off.
 I think the borrow pit is going to be one large mudflat to a great extent.
 Should be shore bird heaven.
 Seeya
 TomS

Thomas A. Schneider

Office of Federal Facilities Oversight
Ohio EPA
t (937) 285-6466
f (937) 285-6404
<http://offo2.epa.state.oh.us>
tom.schneider@epa.state.oh.us

4674

>>> <Bill_Kurey@fws.gov> 11/25/02 03:37PM >>>

Tom,

I agree with your comments. I was also wondering if we couldn't make a very gradual slope, like 100:1, on one side of each of the pools in the borrow area. This would get us more expansive areas of shallow water. Shorebirds would like it, at least until it became heavily vegetated.

It might also be better for amphibians other than bullfrogs. I'm a little worried about bullfrogs since I saw the mitigation bank wetlands at Slate Run Metropark. They have taken over. Let me know what you think. Bye.

Bill

"Tom Schneider"

<Tom.Schneider@epa.s
<Eric.Woods@fernald.gov>, To:
tate.oh.us>
<Pete.Yerace@fernald.gov>, <Bill_Kurey@FWS.GOV>
cc: "Donna
Bohannon" <Donna.Bohannon@epa.state.oh.us>, 11/20/2002 12:58 PM
"Joe Bartoszek"
<Joe.Bartoszek@epa.state.oh.us>, "Lillian
Gonzalez"
<lillian.gonzalez@epa.state.oh.us>,
<Johnny.Reising@fernald.gov>, <John_Homer@fernald.gov>
Subject: borrow pit
drawing comments

Haha get publishing figured out then forget to attach comments!

I have attached our comments on the revised borrow pit drawings. I think I figured how to submit it for publishing as well!! So maybe it will show up on e-desk. Glad to discuss comments if you would like.
Seeya
TomS

Thomas A. Schneider
Office of Federal Facilities Oversight
Ohio EPA
t (937) 285-6466
f (937) 285-6404
<http://offo2.epa.state.oh.us>
tom.schneider@epa.state.oh.us (See attached file: borrowpit20021120.doc)

Ohio EPA Comments on
Borrow Area Drawing 90X-5500-G-00619 & -00620
November 20, 2002

1. Drawing 00619, Note 6: Why is no topsoil being proposed for placement below elevation 571? It appears to Ohio EPA that Subarea 2 will act like a large mudflat with water levels receding over the course of the summer. The area should be covered with at least a 6" layer of topsoil to support vegetation during drying periods. Considering the large quantity of available topsoil this shouldn't be difficult to obtain.
2. Drawing 00619, Note 5: Similar to the previous comment, Ohio EPA believes it is important to seed the entirety of Subarea 2. Unless an area is going to be permanently inundated by a foot of water or more it should be seeded. This seed will provide available seed bank for periods of drying supporting essential vegetative cover. If not seeded this area is likely to become a large monoculture of cattails. Plugging would also be useful to prevent such a monoculture establishment.
3. Drawing 00619, Silt fence: The proposed placement of silt fence probably doesn't provide much benefit to the project and should be eliminated. It simply places an additional maintenance burden without providing any tangible environmental benefit considering the area is designed as a sediment basin. Silt fence should be installed along the eastern project area where drainage from the clay screening area stockpiles may impact the restoration.
4. Drawing 00620, Island Typical: The drawing calls for a "minimum 2'" vertical elevation. Our previous comments recommended the islands but with a 2' maximum elevation. The drawing should be revised to ensure construction personnel do not create islands that are too high.
5. Specification 06930 Ohio EPA recommends changing the permanent wet mix to replace yellow coneflower (*Ratibida pinnata*) with sawtooth sunflower (*Helianthus grosserratus*). Sawtooth sunflower is better suited to wet conditions and is a good food source for wildlife. Additionally, Ohio EPA recommends replacement of purple prairie clover (*Petalostemum purpureum*) with Dotted Horsemint (*Monarda punctata*). This recommendation is due to questions regarding the native status of purple prairie clover in Ohio and the demonstrated success of Dotted Horsemint in the Carolina area.

Ohio EPA Comments on
Borrow Area Drawing 90x-5500-G-00

1. The drawing is a much improved concept over ones we have seen previously. It looks to have plenty of potential for diverse habitat.

Response: The Conceptual Draft drawing has been improved based on comments from DOE and OEPA.

2. In order to more effectively manage the borrow area as a restoration project, replacement of the existing outlet structure with an adjustable control structure (as used in the SWU) should be planned. This could be completed as part of restoration of the remaining areas at a later date.

Response: The existing outlet structure could be modified with an adjustable control structure at a later date.

3. The drawing should include a note detailing the seeding specification to be used.

Response: Notes will be added to refer to seeding specification sections.

4. A note should be added to the drawing directing construction personnel to leave a rough surface with topographical irregularities to provide microhabitats within the wetlands.

Response: Notes to this affect will be added to the final drawing.

5. The drawing shows a mound in the southern portion of Subarea 2. Will the mound remain or be removed? If it remains its should be sculpted to some more naturalistic grading.

Response: The mound shown by existing coutours is a topsoil pile. This material is intended to be spread in fill areas.

6. The drawing doesn't provide any information regarding topsoil application or soil amendment. Numerous proposals regarding topsoil and amendments have been discussed over time so some clarity is needed regarding this issue.

Response: Notes concerning topsoil application or soil amendment will be added to the final drawing.

7. Are the grades presented final including any topsoil/amendment?

Response: Grades shown are final grades including topsoil/amendment on the Conceptual Draft drawing.

8. At one point an island was proposed around MW2400. The drawing doesn't clearly show this. Is the island still proposed?

Response: Monitoring well MW2400 has been abandoned. This island shall be eliminated from the drawings.

9. We believe some positive elevation changes would be beneficial enhancements to the design. We suggest the addition of some islands of no greater elevation change than 2' to provide habitats for nesting birds, etc.

Response: Contours will be added to the final drawings to provide small areas for naturally shaped islands of no greater than 2 foot in elevation change.

Ohio EPA Comments on
Borrow Area Drawing 90x-5500-G-00

1. The drawing is a much improved concept over ones we have seen previously. It looks to have plenty of potential for diverse habitat.
2. In order to more effectively manage the borrow area as a restoration project, replacement of the existing outlet structure with an adjustable control structure (as used in the SWU) should be planned. This could be completed as part of restoration of the remaining areas at a later date.
3. The drawing should include a note detailing the seeding specification to be used.
4. A note should be added to the drawing directing construction personnel to leave a rough surface with topographical irregularities to provide microhabitats within the wetlands.
5. The drawing shows a mound in the southern portion of Subarea 2. Will the mound remain or be removed? If it remains it should be sculpted to some more naturalistic grading.
6. The drawing doesn't provide any information regarding topsoil application or soil amendment. Numerous proposals regarding topsoil and amendments have been discussed over time so some clarity is needed regarding this issue.
7. Are the grades presented final including any topsoil/amendment?
8. At one point an island was proposed around MW2400. The drawing doesn't clearly show this. Is the island still proposed?
9. We believe some positive elevation changes would be beneficial enhancements to the design. We suggest the addition of some islands of no greater elevation change than 2' to provide habitats for nesting birds, etc.